UNITED	STATES	DIST	RICT	COURT	
SOUTHERN	DISTRIC	CT OF	CAL	IFORNI <i>a</i>	Ā

BEFORE HONORABLE DANA M. SABRAW, JUDGE PRESIDING

JENNIFER RODRIGUEZ; AND, JOHN TAURO, INDIVIDUALLY AND ON BEHALF OF ALL OTHERS SIMILARLY SITUATED))) CASE NO. 13CV0388-DMS
PLAINTIFFS,)
VS.))
ALLIED INTERSTATES, LLC,) SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA) FEBRUARY 5, 2014) 11:15 A.M. CALENDAR
DEFENDANT.)

REPORTER'S TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
TELEPHONIC MOTION HEARING

REPORTED BY:

LEE ANN PENCE,
OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER
UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE
333 WEST BROADWAY, ROOM 1393
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101

GOUNGEL ADDEADING BELEDVONIGNIN				
COUNSEL APPEARING TELEPHONICALLY:				
FOR PLAINTIFF:	MATTHEW MICHAEL LOKER, ESQ. KAZEROUNI LAW GROUP 245 FISCHER AVENUE UNIT D1 COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626			
FOR DEFENDANT:	BROOKS R. BROWN, ESQ. GOODWIN PROCTER 601 S FIGUEROA STREET 41ST FLOOR LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90017			

```
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA - WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 2014 11:15 A.M.
 1
 2
 3
               THE COURT: GOOD MORNING. THIS IS JUDGE SABRAW.
    WHO IS ON THE LINE?
 4
 5
              MR. LOKER: (TELEPHONICALLY) GOOD MORNING, YOUR
 6
    HONOR. MATT LOKER ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFFS.
 7
              MR. BROWN: (TELEPHONICALLY) GOOD MORNING, YOUR
    HONOR. BROOKS BROWN ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANT.
 8
 9
               THE COURT: THANK YOU. AND WE ARE ON THE RECORD.
10
               I APPRECIATE COUNSEL PARTICIPATING TELEPHONICALLY ON
     SHORT NOTICE.
11
12
               I HAVE READ THE BRIEFING, AND LET ME QUESTION
13
    MR. LOKER FIRST.
14
               DO YOU DESIRE TO TAKE THE DEPOSITION OF THESE FOUR
    INDIVIDUALS AS WELL? LET'S START WITH THAT.
1.5
16
              MR. LOKER: SORRY?
17
               THE COURT: MY TENTATIVE THOUGHT WAS THAT FOR THE
18
    REASONS SET FORTH IN THE DEFENDANT'S BRIEFING, THAT THIS CASE
19
     IS DISTINGUISHABLE FROM OTHERS THAT WERE REFERENCED IN THE
20
    PLAINTIFF'S BRIEFING, AND THAT STRIKING OR EXCLUDING THE
21
    TESTIMONY MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE. BUT RATHER THAT IN THE
22
    EVENT THE PLAINTIFFS WANT TO TAKE THAT DISCOVERY THAT THEY BE
    GIVEN AN OPPORTUNITY TO DO THAT, AND TO GIVE ADDITIONAL TIME
23
24
    FOR THE REPLY BRIEF.
               AND SO MY TENTATIVE THOUGHT WAS TO ADDRESS THE
25
```

1.5

DISCOVERY ISSUE IN THAT MANNER. ULTIMATELY, TO ALLOW THE DISCOVERY TO GO FORWARD, TO ALLOW THE DEFENDANTS TO USE THE INFORMATION, BUT TO PROVIDE THE PLAINTIFF WITH AN OPPORTUNITY TO TAKE DISCOVERY AND HAVE ADDITIONAL TIME FOR BRIEFING, IF NECESSARY.

MR. LOKER: YES, YOUR HONOR. THE REASON WE WOULD RATHER, YOU KNOW, NOT DO THAT, WE HAVE BEEN TO DC ONCE FOR DEPOSITIONS, WE FEEL IF WE GO OUT THERE AGAIN THAT WOULD CREATE HARM FOR US. IT IS GOING TO COST THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS TO FLY ACROSS THE COUNTRY, BOOK A COURT REPORTER, AND GET HOTELS.

OUR POSITION IS THAT THESE WITNESSES WERE KNOWN BY ALLIED FROM THE BEGINNING. IF THEY WOULD HAVE BEEN DISCLOSED TO US IN THE BEGINNING WE WOULD HAVE STAYED IN DC FOR A COUPLE OF DIFFERENT DAYS AND TAKEN THE DEPOSITIONS. AT THIS POINT, A COUPLE OF HOURS BEFORE THEY FILED THE OPPOSITION, THERE IS NEW TESTIMONY WE HADN'T BEEN MADE AWARE OF. WE DON'T THINK WE HAVE TO CHANGE OUR THEORY OF THE CASE WHEN THIS TESTIMONY WAS AVAILABLE, REALLY, SINCE 2009.

THE COURT: THAT PREJUDICE IS A COST-BASED ONE.

WHAT IF THERE IS SOME TYPE OF PROVISION TO SHIFT FEES OR COSTS

WITH RESPECT TO THIS DISCOVERY?

MR. LOKER: IT IS, YOU KNOW, I THINK MORE THAN JUST COST-BASED, YOUR HONOR. ONE OF THE CASES THAT ALLIED CITED, DEY V. IVAX, THAT CASE SAID THE DISCOVERY IS MUTUAL, SO WE

HAVE THE RIGHT TO KNOW THE POSITIONS THAT ALLIED WAS GOING TO 1 2 TAKE. AND BASED ON THE TESTIMONY THEY RECEIVED AND THE 3 DISCOVERY RESPONSES WE RECEIVED WE SET UP OUR MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION BASED UPON THAT. SO, YOU KNOW, COST ASIDE, IF 4 5 WE HAVE TO GO BACK TO THE DRAWING TABLE IT IS JUST GOING TO 6 PROLONG THIS CASE AND PUSH IT OUT, IN OUR OPINION DAMAGE THE 7 CASE THE LONGER THEY HAVE TO WAIT TO GET IT RESOLVED. 8 THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. 9 MR. BROWN, WHAT IS YOUR POSITION? 10 MR. BROWN: YOUR HONOR, I THINK, YOUR HONOR, WE HAVE 11 LAID OUT THE POSITION. I THINK THAT WE CERTAINLY MET AND 12 CONFERRED, WE TALKED IN THE INTERIM BETWEEN THE BRIEFING HERE, 13 EVEN ON AN EXPEDITED BASIS OUR CLIENT -- WHETHER THE 14 DEPOSITIONS MIGHT BE TAKING PLACE, AND I PREPARED THEM FOR 1.5 THAT. 16 I DON'T THINK WHAT MR. LOKER IS ARTICULATING IS 17 SOMETHING THAT, QUITE CANDIDLY, FROM A PRACTICAL STANDPOINT, 18 CAN HAPPEN AT ANY DEPOSITION. I THINK WE HAVE ALL BEEN IN 19 POSITIONS, YOU GO AND TAKE DEPOSITIONS IN A PARTICULAR CASE 20 AND THE WITNESS IDENTIFIES OTHER PEOPLE THAT MAY OR MAY NOT BE 21 IN THAT PLACE AT THE SAME TIME. THAT IS THE NATURE OF THE 22 PROCESS. MR. LOKER AND HIS TEAM DECIDED TO BRING A PUTATIVE 23 CLASS ACTION AGAINST AN ORGANIZATION AND COMPANY THAT IS NOT 24

BASED IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, SO THESE ARE THINGS KNOWN TO

25

1.5

THEM WHEN THEY BRING ON A CASE LIKE THIS. THAT'S WHAT IT IS.

IF THEY WANTED TO DEPOSE OTHER PEOPLE THEY HAD AN OPPORTUNITY

AND CHANCE TO DO THAT BASED ON THE DISCLOSURES.

AS WE LAY OUT IN THE BRIEF, THIS IS WHAT THE WITNESSES ARE TESTIFYING TO, NAMELY THAT A CREDITOR SOMETIMES GETS CELL PHONE INFORMATION FROM ITS DEBTORS AND FOR PURPOSES OF CONTACTING THEM ABOUT THEIR ACCOUNTS IS SOMETHING THAT HAS BEEN WELL-KNOWN TO THEM. AND MS. HORNBUCKLE'S DEPOSITION IS REPLETE WITH REFERENCES BY MR. LOCKER HIMSELF, WELL BEFORE A CERTIFICATION BRIEF WAS FILED, BEFORE HE KNEW THAT, QUITE CANDIDLY, NOT HAD A CHANCE TO ANALYZE IT MUCH, CONSISTENT WITH YOUR HONOR'S DECISION IN THE NEWMAN CASE JUST EARLIER THIS WEEK, A CLASS SETTLEMENT RECOGNIZING THAT, IN THAT CASE AMERICREDIT MIGHT HAVE INFORMATION IN THEIR RECORDS WITH THEIR DEBTORS GIVING THEM CONSENT.

I DON'T THINK IT IS A SURPRISE. ONE OF MR. LOKER'S STATEMENTS IN MS. HORNBUCKLE'S DEPOSITION HE SAYS THAT YOU TESTIFIED EARLIER, AND OBVIOUSLY CORRECT ME IF I AM WRONG, THAT THERE IS, YOU KNOW, A WHOLE NUMBER OF WAYS THAT THE PREDECESSOR, WHETHER IT IS THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION OR SOMEONE ELSE, INDICATES A PARTICULAR NUMBER HAS PRIOR EXPRESS CONSENT TO RECEIVE THE AUTO DIALED CALLS.

GIVEN THAT HE IS SAYING THAT A MONTH BEFORE HE FILED

THEIR CERTIFICATION MOTION, I DON'T SEE HOW THERE IS UNFAIR

SURPRISE HERE, OR ANYTHING THAT WOULD JUSTIFY PRECLUDING US

FROM USING THE DECLARANTS. 1 2 THE COURT: OKAY. 3 MR. LOKER, DO YOU DESIRE TO TAKE THESE DEPOSITIONS 4 OF THESE FOUR? 5 MR. LOKER: YOUR HONOR, I WOULD PREFER THAT 6 MOTION -- DECLARATIONS WEREN'T IN THAT MOTION. THE QUESTIONS 7 I HAVE ASKED MS. HORNBUCKLE, OTHERS WHO HAVE DEPOSITIONS WERE 8 FOCUSED ON HOW WE WERE GOING TO CERTIFY THE CLASS. 9 IF TESTIMONY WAS AVAILABLE TO US AT THAT POINT AND 10 THESE PEOPLE WERE IDENTIFIED WE WOULD HAVE STAYED IN DC, LIKE 11 I SAID, AND TAKEN THE DEPOSITIONS, YOU KNOW, TO SUPPLEMENT 12 THEIR DISCLOSURES AND SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES. 6:46 ON A 13 FRIDAY NIGHT WE JUST DIDN'T HAVE TIME TO ACT IN THE WAY THAT THE -- FOR EXAMPLE ASHMAN, SOME OF THE CASES THAT MR. BROWN 14 CITED IN HIS BRIEF WHERE THE SUPPLEMENTATION DID COME BUT IT 1.5 WASN'T ENOUGH TIME TO ACT ACCORDINGLY. I JUST DON'T THINK 16 17 THESE DECLARATIONS SHOULD BE CONSIDERED IN ANY WAY. 18 THE COURT: IF THE MOTION, THE PLAINTIFF'S MOTION, 19 IS DENIED WITH RESPECT TO STRIKING THE DECLARATIONS, WHAT 20 WOULD BE YOUR REQUEST? IN OTHER WORDS, DO YOU REQUEST THAT 21 YOU BE ALLOWED TO TAKE THE DEPOSITIONS AND TO POSTPONE THE 22

FILING OF YOUR REPLY AS WELL AS THE PRESENTLY SET HEARING ON THE MOTION TO CERTIFY?

23

24

25

MR. LOKER: YES, THAT WOULD BE CORRECT, YOUR HONOR. IF OUR MOTION IS DENIED WE REQUEST ADDITIONAL TIME FOR

1.5

DEPOSITIONS AND TO PREPARE OUR MOTION FOR CLASS CERTIFICATION

IF IT CHANGED BASED UPON TESTIMONY.

THE COURT: WITH RESPECT TO ANY DISCOVERY, HOW QUICKLY COULD THAT BE DONE, MR. BROWN? DO YOU HAVE ANY INFORMATION?

MR. BROWN: SURE, YOUR HONOR. I WOULD ANTICIPATE -MR. LOKER'S DEPOSITIONS, THE 30(B)(6) ON MULTIPLE CATEGORIES,
WERE TWO HOURS OR LESS. AS YOUR HONOR PROBABLY KNOWS FROM THE
BRIEFING, THESE DECLARATIONS OF THESE FOUR WITNESSES ARE THREE
PAGES AND VERY STRAIGHT TO THE POINT. I WOULD THINK THAT
THESE DEPOSITIONS COULD BE ACCOMPLISHED IN AN HOUR, HOUR AND A
HALF, SOMETHING LIKE THAT. PROBABLY GET ALL OF THEM DONE IN A
DAY TO MINIMIZE THE DISRUPTION.

WE HAVE SPOKEN TO THE CLIENT ABOUT THAT AND UNDERSTAND THAT THE WITNESSES WOULD BE AVAILABLE, ACTUALLY IN MINNESOTA, NEXT WEEK FOR THAT IF THAT IS SOMETHING THAT MR. LOKER WANTS TO ACCOMPLISH.

THE FOLLOWING WEEK IS A CHALLENGE. AS YOUR HONOR
MAY KNOW, THOSE IN COLD WEATHER CLIMATES, THE PUBLIC SCHOOL
VACATIONS ALLOW THE OPPORTUNITY TO ESCAPE THAT. ONE IN
FEBRUARY, ONE IN APRIL. THE ONE IN FEBRUARY, AROUND THE
PRESIDENT'S DAY WEEKEND, THE FOLLOWING WEEK, THAT IS A BIT OF
A CHALLENGE. I HAVE NOT LOOKED AT THE THIRD WEEK AT THIS
POINT. THAT WOULD BE THAT -- YOUR HONOR COULD DIRECT THAT
THOSE DEPOSITIONS TAKE PLACE AND SET SOME PARAMETERS AROUND

```
THEM, THEY NEED A CERTAIN NUMBER OF TIME OR LIMITED TO THE
 1
 2
     SUBJECT MATTER SET FORTH IN THE DECLARATION.
 3
               THE COURT: SO YOUR THOUGHT IS THAT ALL FOUR COULD
    BE TAKEN NEXT WEEK, AND PROBABLY ALL FOUR WITHIN ONE DAY.
 4
 5
              MR. BROWN: I WOULD THINK SO. HAVEN'T HAD A CHANCE
 6
     TO TALK TO MR. LOKER. HIS PREFERRED COURSE WOULD BE TO STRIKE
 7
     THAT. THAT WOULD BE MY INITIAL THINKING.
 8
               THE COURT: MR. LOKER, DO YOU AGREE THAT IF THE
    DEPOSITIONS GO FORWARD THEY COULD BE DONE NEXT WEEK AND ALL
 9
10
    WITHIN A DAY?
11
              MR. LOKER: I AM NOT AVAILABLE UNTIL MARCH. I HAVE
12
    TRIAL NEXT WEEK IN OREGON, THE WEEK AFTER I HAVE TRIAL, THE
    LAST WEEK IN FEBRUARY. YOU KNOW, THEY MIGHT -- AS FAR AS WE
13
14
     CAN DO THEM IN ONE DAY OR NOT, THAT IS CERTAINLY A
1.5
    POSSIBILITY. MY TRIAL SCHEDULE IS SET RIGHT NOW, WOULD BE
16
    PUSHING IT TO AT LEAST MARCH.
17
               THE COURT: WOULD YOU BE DOING THE DEPOSITIONS OR
    WOULD THERE BE SOMEONE ELSE AVAILABLE?
18
19
              MR. LOKER: I WOULD BE DOING THE DEPOSITIONS. THERE
20
    WOULD BE ONE OTHER ATTORNEY WITH ME, MORE LIKELY
21
    MR. BRAUNSWAGER[PH.], WITH ME IN DC THE LAST TIME. IT WOULD
22
     BE THE TWO OF US. I WOULD BE PRIMARILY RESPONSIBLE FOR THE
23
    DEPOSITION.
24
               THE COURT: ALL RIGHT. SO YOUR REQUEST, THEN, WOULD
    BE IF THE MOTION TO STRIKE IS DENIED, THEN TO ALLOW YOU UNTIL
25
```

SOMETIME IN MARCH, FIRST OR SECOND WEEK OF MARCH, TO CONDUCT

THE DISCOVERY, THEN PERHAPS A COUPLE WEEKS THEREAFTER TO FILE

YOUR REPLY. WOULD THAT BE CORRECT?

MR. LOKER: SOMETHING AS FAR AS COSTS, AS WELL. IF WE KNEW THE PEOPLE IN DC THE FIRST TIME AROUND WE COULD HAVE STAYED AN EXTRA DAY, WHICH WOULD HAVE BEEN WHATEVER THE HOTEL WAS AND THE COURT REPORTER. AT THIS POINT YOU HAVE TO LOOK AT, IT IS GOING TO BE 1,000 OR \$1,500, PLUS HOTELS, PLUS THE COURT REPORTER, AND THOSE SORTS OF THINGS.

THE COURT: OKAY.

1.5

MR. LOKER: THAT IS WHERE WE SEE HARM IN ALLOWING
THE DEPOSITIONS TO BE TAKEN. WE SHOULD HAVE TAKEN THEM THE
FIRST TIME AROUND.

THE COURT: MY THOUGHT IS THIS. THAT THE MOTION TO STRIKE WOULD BE DENIED. THE REQUEST TO PERMIT DISCOVERY WOULD BE GRANTED. IT SEEMS TO ME WE COULD PROVIDE THAT THE DISCOVERY BE TAKEN BY THE SECOND WEEK OF MARCH, AND THAT ALL FOUR INDIVIDUALS BE DEPOSED WITHIN ONE EIGHT-HOUR DAY. AND THAT THE REPLY BE FILED WITHIN TWO WEEKS THEREAFTER. WE WILL SET A HEARING DATE SOMETIME THEREAFTER, AS WELL. AND THAT THE COSTS WOULD BE BORNE BY THE DEFENDANT. MY INCLINATION WOULD BE TO ORDER THAT THE EXPENSE BE PAID FOR ONE ATTORNEY, PLAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY, AND THE COURT REPORTER, AND ANY RELATED DEPOSITION COSTS.

MR. BROWN.

MR. BROWN: YOUR HONOR, TO BE FAIR, I DON'T -- I AM

NOT -- I THINK THE COST SHIFTING IS UNWARRANTED IN THIS CASE,

AND IF THIS IS SOMETHING THAT YOUR HONOR IS CONSIDERING, I

WOULD AT LEAST LIKE A FEW DAYS TO BRIEF THAT FOR YOUR HONOR.

UNDER THE CIRCUMSTANCES, THAT OBVIOUSLY IS A SIGNIFICANT

SITUATION. THAT WAS A SANCTION THAT HAS NOT BEEN SET FORTH IN

THE BRIEF, NOR IS IT ONE THAT I THINK WOULD BE APPROPRIATE

HERE.

THIS IS A SITUATION WHERE MR. LOKER KEEPS SAYING HE WOULD HAVE TAKEN THE DEPOSITIONS OF THE PEOPLE WHEN HE HAD BEEN IN DC. AS INDICATED EARLIER, THE PEOPLE ARE NOT IN DC. THERE WOULD BE MORE THAN ONE TRIP.

THERE IS NOTHING, I DON'T THINK, ABOUT THE CONDUCT
HERE THAT WARRANTS THAT. IF THE PLAINTIFFS LOST THE
DISCOVERY, THEN THE PLAINTIFFS SHOULD PAY FOR THAT DISCOVERY.
OR WE CAN CERTAINLY WORK OUT ANOTHER ALTERNATIVE TO MINIMIZE
THE COSTS, AND WHETHER THOSE BE TELEPHONIC DEPOSITIONS, VIDEO
CONFERENCE DEPOSITION OR THE LIKE. I THINK THERE ARE A
MULTITUDE OF WAYS TO AMELIORATE SOME OF THIS, NOT REQUIRE
ALLIED HAVING TO PAY FOR DEPOSITIONS THAT THE PLAINTIFFS LAST
WEEK SAID THEY DID NOT WANT, NOW TODAY ARE SAYING THEY DO
WANT.

AND WE POINT OUT IN THE BRIEF, THERE IS NOTHING IN

THE RECORD THAT WOULD SUGGEST IF THE WITNESSES HAD BEEN

DISCLOSED BY NAME EARLIER THAT THE PLAINTIFFS WOULD HAVE TAKEN

THOSE DEPOSITIONS. AS WE POINT OUT, THERE WERE SEVERAL FOLKS
THAT WERE IDENTIFIED BY NAME AS HAVING KNOWLEDGE AS TO MATTERS
THAT MR. LOKER INQUIRED ABOUT AT THE DEPOSITION. THERE WAS NO
FOLLOW-UP DISCOVERY ABOUT THAT.

FURTHER, THROUGHOUT DISCOVERY IN THIS CASE, SINCE

LAST JUNE OF 2013, WE HAVE BEEN DISCLOSING OVER AND OVER AGAIN

THERE ARE MANY EMPLOYEES, COLLECTORS, AGENTS, SUPERVISORS THAT

ARE INVOLVED IN THIS PROCESS AND HAVE KNOWLEDGE THROUGHOUT

THAT ENTIRE TIME PERIOD BEFORE FILING CERTIFICATION. THE

PLAINTIFFS NEVER ONCE ASKED TO IDENTIFY ANY OF THOSE PEOPLE OR

DEPOSE ANY OF THEM.

UNDER THOSE CIRCUMSTANCES, I AM NOT SURE WHAT THE BASIS FOR COST SHIFTING WOULD BE. IF THERE IS GOING TO BE THAT, I WOULD LIKE THE CHANCE TO BRIEF THAT.

THE COURT: LET'S PROCEED THIS WAY. I WILL POSTPONE
THE FILING OF THE REPLY, SO YOU NEED NOT WORRY ABOUT THAT, MR.
LOKER.

AND WHAT I WOULD LIKE TO DO, I AM GOING TO TAKE IT
UNDER SUBMISSION HERE, CONTEMPLATE WHAT BOTH COUNSEL HAVE JUST
ARGUED, AND I WILL ISSUE A VERY BRIEF CONCLUSORY ORDER TODAY
ADDRESSING THIS ISSUE.

AND WHAT I WILL SET OUT IS I WILL BE DENYING THE

MOTION TO STRIKE, BUT THEN I WILL ADDRESS THE ISSUES OF

DISCOVERY, COST SHIFTING, AND THE TIMING OF DISCOVERY AND THE

FILING OF ANY REPLY, AS WELL AS THE RESETTING THE

CERTIFICATION HEARING MOTION. AND I WILL DO THAT BY WRITTEN 1 2 ORDER TODAY. 3 MR. BROWN: SO, YOUR HONOR, THERE WOULD BE NO 4 BRIEFING ON THE COST? 5 THE COURT: I AM GOING TO THINK ABOUT THAT. I MAY 6 INVITE THAT, PERHAPS IN ANOTHER BRIEF OR A VERY SHORT FORMAT. 7 MR. BROWN: THAT WOULD BE MY REQUEST. MY REQUEST 8 WOULD BE FOR THAT AND FOR THE PLAINTIFFS TO SET OUT, IF THAT 9 IS AFFIRMATIVE RELIEF THEY WERE SEEKING, NOT PART OF THE EX 10 PARTE, THAT THEY WOULD GO FIRST IN THAT AND EXPLAIN WHY THAT 11 WOULD BE APPROPRIATE. AND WE HAVE AN OPPORTUNITY TO RESPOND 12 TO THAT, IF THAT IS SOMETHING THEY ARE SEEKING. 13 THE COURT: I WILL THINK ON THOSE, AND I WILL ISSUE THAT ORDER TODAY, OR AT THE LATEST TOMORROW. OKAY. 14 MR. LOKER: ALSO WANT TO MAKE SURE, DIDN'T TAKE THE 15 16 JAMIE AANESON. JAMIE AANESON WAS IDENTIFIED WHEN WE HAD THE 17 HORNBUCKLE DEPOSITION WHEN SHE DIDN'T KNOW THE PARTICULAR ANSWER TO A QUESTION, AND AFTER REVIEWING THE DEPO TRANSCRIPT 18 19 WE THOUGHT THAT THE WRITTEN -- THE DEPOSITION -- OTHER 20 RESPONSES SATISFIED OUR AREA OF INQUIRY WITH RESPECT TO WHAT 21 MS. AANESON WOULD HAVE TESTIFIED TO. 22 WE DIDN'T FLY OUT TO DC OR WHEREVER AANESON IS IN ORDER TO KEEP OUR COST REASONABLE, AND NOT TO JUST TAKE A 23 24 DEPOSITION WHEN WE ALREADY HAD THE INFORMATION WE WANTED. THAT GOES TO MR. BROWN'S POINT, AND THAT IS NOT FOLLOWING UP 25

ON THAT DEPOSITION IS TO KEEP COSTS DOWN. THE COURT: OKAY. ALL RIGHT. VERY GOOD. THANK YOU, COUNSEL, FOR THE SESSION TODAY. AND, AS INDICATED, I WILL ISSUE AN ORDER TODAY OR TOMORROW. MR. BROWN: THANK YOU. MR. LOKER: THANK YOU. THE COURT: THANK YOU. I CERTIFY THAT THE FOREGOING IS A CORRECT TRANSCRIPT FROM THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS IN THE ABOVE-ENTITLED MATTER. S/LEEANN PENCE 2/25/2014 LEEANN PENCE, OFFICIAL COURT REPORTER DATE